

REMARKS

The office action has been carefully reviewed, particularly the examiner's response to applicant's arguments. It is noted that claims 2 and 17-22 have been allowed and that claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 are only objected to. Applicant has amended claim 12 to incorporate the subject matter of independent claim 1 therein and believes that claim 12 should be allowed. The examiner has continued to reject claim 1 as well as dependent claims 3-11 and 14 which depend therefrom stating that an O-ring is a thin angular cylindrical layer. Applicant strongly disputes this characterization of an O-ring. An O-ring has a normal circular cross-sectional configuration and it is believed that the examiner's characterization that it is a thin annular cylindrical layer is contrary to normal English usage. Applicant has not given any unusual definition or characterization of these terms and the description as well as the drawings, particularly Fig. 2, clearly illustrate that the layer 54 is thin, flat and wide and is in an annular cylindrical configuration which is totally unlike an O-ring. Moreover, this very discussion is now part of the record and establishes that applicant believes a thin annular cylindrical layer is not in the shape of an O-ring.

However, in an effort to place the claim in allowable form, claim 1 has been further amended to state that the "layer having a generally uniform thickness and providing a relatively large surface area of contact between said cylindrical inside surface and the nose portion to prevent unwanted rotation between said inside surface and the nose portion and to absorb vibration." It is believed that this recitation further

differentiates the layer as claimed from an O-ring. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested. Since the rejected dependent claims necessarily include the features of amended claim 1 and possibly other dependent claims, and in addition define other structure and/or functionality that is not found in amended claim 1, reconsideration and allowance of the rejected dependent claims is also respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Roger D. Greer
Registration No. 26,174

December 16, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978